

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD —

legislation would be needed. But I feel we should take this one shot now and talk about it afterwards.

I would hate to follow the advice of my good friend, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. Mondt], and have a great big congressional hassle on proposed legislation. Let us sell the wheat now and talk about it later.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The authority for the President to act surely is in the law. The present law gives admonition but not prohibition. However, it seems to me there ought to be a decision made as to which way we are going to go. Either we are going to ask the Congress for a sense-of-Congress resolution or we will take the action after consultations with Congress on this immediate possibility. I say "possibility" because I think the probability is more remote. On this immediate possibility I believe the administration could act after it has made its proper consultations, and I have so recommended. But on any major change of policy I think we need a very careful dialogue between the Congress and the executive branch, and then some legislative action.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a press release I issued September 26 on this subject be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the press release was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

HUMPHREY SEES INCREASED CHANGE FOR CHANGE IN EAST-WEST TRADE POLICY

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, said yesterday that there is an "increasing possibility for a constructive change in American policy on sale of agricultural products to Soviet bloc countries."

HUMPHREY reported that he based his conclusion on personal discussions with "many administration officials and members of Congress."

He said that he will continue to press the administration and Congress "to end the antiquated and costly policy which makes it impossible to trade wheat and other farm products to the Soviet Union and its satellites."

HUMPHREY was one of the first national leaders to urge a "reexamination and overhaul" of U.S. policy on trade with the Soviet Union. He made his proposals both before and after the recent announcement of Canada's sale of \$500 million worth of wheat to the Soviet Union.

"Let us let American farmers be Americans," HUMPHREY said, "instead of stifling them with controls. Let them produce what is needed, seek the customers that are available, and sell when they can."

"Our American farmers developed a magnificent productive capacity through the spirit of free enterprise. They should be able to market their products in the same spirit of American free enterprise."

HUMPHREY reported that he has stressed four key points in his discussions with administration and congressional leaders:

1. The United States has agricultural products to sell, in both quantity and quality.
2. There are ready markets for those products in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. Our products can be sold to them for cash, for gold and for short-term credits.
3. The sale of wheat and other agricultural products and surplus can reduce costs to taxpayers for storage and other expenses and reduce the budget.
4. The sale of wheat and other commodities for dollars will relieve the severe balance-of-payments situation.

HUMPHREY said that the sale of wheat and other farm products to the Soviet Union "will not adversely affect our security." "Food will not feed the furnaces of destruction," he said. "It can help build a better world. Food is an instrument of peace, not a weapon of war."

The Senate majority whip added that increased East-West trade, "at least in agricultural products," can tend to "improve the political relationships between nations by providing a sound economic basis for cooperation."

He concluded: "Sale of wheat and other farm products means cash for our economy; jobs for our farmers and mill workers and strength for our Nation."

Mr. HUMPHREY. I now yield to the Senator from Iowa. I should like to ask him if he is going to brag about Iowa.

Mr. MILLER. My friend, the Senator from Minnesota, has yielded to me after all the discussion about fishing has taken place. However, I did think I ought to make the point that, granted the beauty of the trout streams and the wonder of the sky-blue waters in Minnesota, I deeply regret that the best information that I have is that by the time we get out of here this year, there will be no free-flowing waters, and the Senator might just as well come down to my State and do some ice fishing.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is a mighty kind offer and I will give it serious consideration. But since the Senator from Iowa has brought up the subject of ice fishing, I would like him to know that in Minnesota we provide all the comforts of home for ice fishing. We provide those fine little huts that we put out in the lake. We chop a hole through the ice and we can see those nice walleyed pike and all the other fine and wonderful fish we have. Of course, if one should fall in, as occasionally happens, it requires a certain amount of therapeutic treatment.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. The trouble is that it is so cold in the State of the Senator, and the ice is so thick, one is worn out by the time he chops the hole.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Not at all. We in Minnesota are a vigorous people.

Mr. MILLER. The cold air gets through those huts very quickly. Why not come to Iowa and be more comfortable?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator for his invitation. I presume everything will be taken care of.

Mr. MILLER. It is a standing invitation.

CIA IN VIETNAM

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, in yesterday's Washington Daily News appears a lead editorial entitled "What's Wrong in South Vietnam?" There also appeared a very excellent article on page 3 entitled "Arrogant CIA Disobeys Orders in Vietnam." The sum and substance of these items is that certain officials in the CIA and South Vietnam have apparently refused to follow the instructions of the American Ambassador to South Vietnam.

It is well known that in a foreign country the Ambassador is in the shoes

should take place in, of all countries, South Vietnam, is difficult to understand. I hope that upon the return of Mr. McNamara and General Taylor appropriate disciplinary action will be taken against the CIA officials who have seen fit not to follow protocol in that respect. Furthermore, I hope that it will be made very clear to the Director of CIA that what has occurred is not about to take place in any other embassy of the United States in the world.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial and article to which I have referred be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

(From the Washington Daily News, October 2, 1963)

WHAT'S WRONG IN SOUTH VIETNAM
It is a brutally messed-up state of affairs that our man, Richard Starke, reports from South Vietnam his his article on page 3 of today.

And the mess he has found isn't Vietnamese. It is American, involving bitter strife among U.S. agencies—which may help explain the vast cost and lack of satisfactory progress in this operation to contain Communist aggression.

The whole situation, as described by Mr. Starke, must be shocking to Americans who believe we are engaged in a solemn crusade to protect democracy in this far-off land.

He has been told that:

The U.S. Central Intelligence Agency—CIA—has flatly refused to carry out instructions from Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge, frustrating a plan of action he took from Washington.

Secret agents, or "spooks," from CIA "have penetrated every branch of the American community in Saigon."

Who are we fighting there anyway? The Communists, or our own people?

The CIA agents represent a tremendous power and are totally unaccountable to anyone. They dabble and interfere in military operations, to the frustration of our military officials.

The bitterness of other American agencies in Saigon toward the CIA, Starke found, is "almost unbelievable."

On the basis of this last statement alone, there is something terribly wrong with our system out there.

Defense Secretary McNamara just finished his investigation on the ground in Vietnam and is preparing to report to the President. Mr. McNamara is a tough man of decisive action. It may be assumed he now is in a position to assess the blame for this quarrelling and backbiting among the American family—whether it falls on the CIA or other agencies which accuse the CIA.

One way or the other, some official heads should roll.

(From the Washington Daily News, October 2, 1963)

"SPOOKS" MAKE LIFE MISERABLE FOR AMBASSADOR LOSES—"ARROGANT" CIA DISOBEYS ORDERS IN VIETNAM

(By Richard Starke)
SAIGON, October 2.—The story of the Central Intelligence Agency's role in South Vietnam is a dismal chronicle of bureaucratic arrogance, obstinate disregard of orders, and unrestrained thirst for power.

Twice the CIA flatly refused to carry out instructions from Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge, according to a high U.S. source here. In one of these instances the CIA frustrated a plan of action Mr. Lodge brought